THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

16 April 1992

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes:

20 February 1992

B. Dates of next meetings:

21 May 1992
18 June 1992

C. Confirmation of 19 March 1992 approval of O.G. and S.L. appendix actions.

D. Confirmation of final concept design for White House guard booths.

E. Staff proposal: Master plan for street lighting. Discussion.

F. Inspection of 2620 Rock Creek Drive site conditions for conformance to Declaration of Covenant; 9 February 1990; U.S. District Court Civil Action No. 89-364 SSH, Instrument No. 9646.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 16/Apr/92-1, Federal Triangle Development site, 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Design development. (Previous: CFA 26/Jun/91-2.)

B. U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum

CFA 16/Apr/92-2, U.S. Holocaust Museum, between 14th and 15th Streets, S.W. Location for inscription, sculpture and flag poles; omission of west plaza fountain and pool.

C. Smithsonian Institution

1. CFA 16/Apr/92-3, Freer Gallery of Art, 12th Street and Jefferson Drive, S.W. Proposed site modifications, landscape and paving. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 16/Jan/92-4.)

2. CFA 16/Apr/92-4, National Zoological Park. Renovation of and rear addition to existing Monkey House, including "overhead Orangutan Transit System (OTS)." Preliminary design.

D. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 16/Apr/92-5, Vietnam Women's Memorial. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 19/Sep/91-1.)

2. CFA 16/Apr/92-6, East Potomac Park Golf Course, Ohio Drive, S.W. Preliminary design.

E. Department of the Army, US Army Corps of Engineers

CFA 16/Apr/92-7, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia. Facility maintenance complex. Preliminary design.

F. Department of Justice

CFA 16/Apr/92-8, J. Edgar Hoover Building, 935 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Child care area. Preliminary design.

G. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act *

Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix II.

* An informal discussion of proposed banners for the Corcoran Gallery of Art followed approval of the Shipstead-Luce appendix.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 92-26 HPA. 92-168	507 2nd Street, N.E. Nike, Inc. Office townhouse	Alterations and rear addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations and rear addition as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 6 March 1992.

S.L. 92-27 HPA. 92-187	1422 H Street, N.W. S.J.G. Properties The Woodward Building	Storefront alterations - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to storefront to replicate original condition as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 11 March 1992. Submit proposal for replacement of sidewalk due to the removal of existing projecting storefront bay when ready.

S.L. 92-29	150 F Street, N.E. Second Street Ltd. Part. Station Place Phase I	New building - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for construction of Phase I of Station Place excluding tower pending submission of supplemental drawings. Material sample panel shall be erected on site for approval prior to final construction. See previous action S.L. 91-101. NOTE: This project has been resubmitted due to a technicality. The Commission had previously reviewed and approved construction drawings with the same comments on the development of the tower element.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 92-30 HPA. 92-196	2222 Q Street, N.W. Tribby Properties, Inc. Apartment building	Window replacement - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement windows to match dimensions, configuration, and profile of existing windows. New replacement windows at street front will be wood with true muntins and divided lights as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 10 March 1992. See previous action S.L. 91-149.

S.L. 92-31 HPA. 92-211	300 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E. Crestar Bank	Signs - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement signs which match location and dimensions of existing signs.

S.L. 92-32	1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Lincoln Square Corporation Barista Coffee and Espresso Bars	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign at entrance doorway on side street. Action is taken on the individual merits of this proposal alone and should not be considered favoring similar departures in sign design.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 91-91 HPA. 91-479	2611 Dumbarton Street, N.W. Gillette/Hoppman Residence	Alterations - revised concept

ACTION: Returned without Action. Submit revised concept in response to the Commission's recommendations when ready.

O.G. 92-30 HPA. 92-121	1314 29th Street, N.W. Saile and Owens Residence	New facade - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed facade alterations which include replacement windows with 6 over 6 true divided light wood windows on second floor and enlargement of window opening on first floor as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 5 February 1992. Railings on steps, areaway, and window sills are approved as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 18 March 1992.

O.G. 92-33 HPA. 92-134	3345 M Street, N.W. Spencer and Estelle Diamond Metropark/Eagle Liquor	Sign - revised design - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition of sign to existing pole as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 13 March 1992.

O.G. 92-39 HPA. 92-158	2706 Olive Street, N.W. Edward Echeverria Residence	Alterations to basement windows - permit

ACTION: No objection to raising sill of existing basement windows and installation of double-hung wood sash with true muntins in 3 over 6 or 6 over 3 light configuration.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-41 HPA. 92-166	1221 36th Street, N.W. Georgetown University Loyola, Xavier, & Ryder Halls	Additions - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for proposed alterations and additions. Recommend further study of proposed new courtyard elevation with respect to existing structures. Submit for final review when working drawings are ready.

O.G. 92-42 HPA. 92-173	1691 34th Street, N.W. Charles Percy Residence	Addition of elevator shaft - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of proposed elevator shaft concealed as a side wall chimney. In working out final design, recommend study of details to further reduce profile of "chimney".

O.G. 92-44 HPA. 92-177	3414 P Street, N.W. Richard Frank Residence	Alterations, rear bay, A/C unit and siding - concept

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case superseded by O.G. 92-52.

O.G. 92-46 HPA. 92-180	1221 36th Street, N.W. Georgetown University Walsh Building	Alterations/ replacement of windows and doors - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for replacement windows and addition of vents.

O.G. 92-47 HPA. 92-181	3000 M Street, N.W. Marbury Inc. Marbury Georgetown Hotel	Satellite antenna on roof - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of proposed satellite dish which will be positioned to be minimally visible from public space. Submit for final review when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-48 HPA. 92-171	3800 Reservoir Road, N.W. Georgetown University Hospital Concentrated Care Center	Enclosure of podium, stairs, additions, pedestrian bridges, canopy - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of enclosure of podium, proposed additions, or pedestrian bridges. Submit additional concept studies of terrace canopy, and new day care entrance stair and elevator tower.

O.G. 92-49 HPA. 92-185	1248 36th Street, N.W. Georgetown University Revisions to permit no. B350157	New access ramp and rebuild stairwell - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for revisions to permit number B350157.

O.G. 92-52 HPA. 92-206	3414 P Street, N.W. Richard Frank Residence	Alterations, rear bay, A/C unit and siding - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 92-35 HPA. 92-240	1755 Newton Street, N.W. Bancroft Elementary School	Repair work - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed repair work, replacement of fences, and new retaining walls.

S.L. 92-36 HPA. 92-243	107 2nd Street, N.E. Werner Fornos Residence	Front yard wall and planter - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed brick wall and planter at front yard. Recommend removal of existing planter along sidewalk erected without approval. Recommend concrete treads on steps to be painted to match steps leading to house.

S.L. 92-37 HPA. 92-258	2246 Cathedral Avenue, N.W. Hadley and Simon Residence	Alterations and bay window - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations and addition of bay window to rear of house.

S.L. 92-38	2600 Virginia Avenue, N.W. Watergate Management Corp. The Watergate Office building	Courtyard trellis and landscaping - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to courtyard which include new planters, trellis, and landscaping.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-40 HPA. 92-165	1267 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. The GAP	Signs - revised design - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed three signs as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 21 April 1992. Signs will have no internal illumination. Gooseneck lamps shown are appropriate. No objection to oversize 18 in. letters in this case.

O.G. 92-43 HPA. 92-178	2715 Q Street, N.W. National Society of the Colonial Dames of America Dumbarton House	Landscape plan - revised design - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed landscape improvements to east garden and parking area as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 14 April 1992.

O.G. 92-50 HPA. 92-195	1564 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Emille Ardetle Nakeysa Restaurant	Awning - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed canvas structure which would be inappropriate for building.

O.G. 92-53 HPA. 92-209	3139 M Street, N.W. Germar Properties All American Bar-B-Que	Projecting sign - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for projecting sign which would be inappropriate at this location. Recommend submission for sign painted on existing fascia in location of existing sign.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-54 HPA. 92-230	2814 R Street, N.W. Michael Goldberg Residence	Portico over entrance stoop - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 14 April 1992 which indicate paired columns supporting a semicircular-arched canopy. Submit working drawings when ready.

O.G. 92-56 HPA. 92-233	1652 33rd Street, N.W. Milorad Jeftich Residence	Rear addition, deck, and front alterations - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of rear addition, rear deck, and alterations to front steps as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 13 April 1992. Revised concept includes wood siding on new construction, a shorter deck without a trellis, and more uniformity in door and window design at rear elevation. Submit working drawings for permit review when ready.

O.G. 92-57 HPA. 92-236	1301 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. John Gantz Stoupsy's	Alterations and new signs - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of proposed alterations to building with exception of extension of awning material across N Street elevation. Recommend reopening roof dormer overlooking Wisconsin Avenue. Submit separate sign permit including retention of existing roof ridge neon housing, elimination of dormer sign, and reduction in proposed size of N Street entrance sign. Recommend separate submission for proposed sidewalk cafe including additional study of a lighter, more open enclosure system.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 92-55 HPA. 92-232	3140 M Street, N.W. Door Store	Alterations to storefront - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to proposed concept design. Recommend reduction in scale of entablature (maintaining frieze dimension for lettering) between new show windows and slope of glass roof. Submit working drawings when ready.

O.G. 92-60 HPA. 92-239	1517 30th Street, N.W. Marc Matthews Condominiums	Brick garden wall - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed masonry garden wall as shown in supplemental drawing received and dated 9 April 1992 indicating a brick archway for a vertical board garden gate.

O.G. 92-61 HPA. 92-225	1729 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Carter-Miot-Eng. Co. Inc. Nations Bank	Replacement of projecting sign - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for projecting sign which is inappropriate at this location. Recommend submission for sign consisting of individual letters pin-mounted to building wall.

O.G. 92-66 HPA. 92-265	3700 O Street, N.W. Georgetown University Village A Dormitory	Replacement of metal doors with wood doors - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement of metal doors with wood doors.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS PRE-MEETING TOUR

16 April 1992

CONVENE: 8:00 AM, Pension Building, Suite 312,
441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

1. National Zoological Park, Monkey House.

2. U.S. Holocaust Memorial offices, 2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 717.

Members Present:

The Hon. J. Carter Brown
The Hon. B. Peck
The Hon. G. Hartman
The Hon. N. Potter field
The Hon. J. Abercrombie
The Hon. A. Chatfield-Taylor

Staff Present: Don Myer
José Martinez
Sue Kohler

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

16 April 1992

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at the Pension Building, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., after a tour of a project site at the National Zoo and inspection of a model at the offices of the U. S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Neil H. Porterfield, Vice-Chairman Hon. Joan Abrahamson Hon. Adele Chatfield-Taylor Hon. George E. Hartman Hon. Robert A. Peck
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler Mr. Jose Martinez-Canino
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Patrick Tribe

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes of the 20 February 1992 meeting. The minutes were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings. Approved as:
21 May 1992
18 June 1992

C. Confirmation of 19 March 1992 approval of O.G. and S.L.appendix actions. Approval of both appendices was confirmed.

D. Confirmation of final concept design for White House guard booths. The Secretary noted that the designs had been circulated to the members, and there had been a consensus that

the concept could be approved, but the details still needed more work; column spacing, for example, needed to be revised in some versions. Ms. Abrahamson was concerned that the booths made too much of an architectural statement; she also noted the inconvenience of further security checks for those already holding passes, but the Chairman and the Secretary did not think the Commission could get involved in such internal matters. Mr. Hartman thought a good beginning had been made, but agreed with the other members that there should be a further submission. The Chairman commented on the unattractive weathering of the visitors' security building on East Executive Avenue, saying this should be considered when choosing a material for the guard booths, but he thought the building itself was very successful. Mr. Hartman agreed, and said he thought the detailing on this building set a good example for the guard booths. Exhibit A

E. Staff proposal: Master plan for street lighting. Discussion. The Secretary noted the renewed interest in lighting, citing the recent series of meetings sponsored by the DOT on Mall lighting, the Smithsonian's interest in lighting their buildings and grounds, and PADC's involvement in lighting on Pennsylvania Avenue and F Street. He said there had been many studies, and NCPC had produced a diagram showing the various kinds of lighting in the city, but as yet there had been no overall plan proposed. He said the staff had come up with a plan that he would like to circulate to the other agencies involved with lighting, if the Commission approved. He showed two maps of the city, with the two phases of the plan delineated on them. Phase 1 would be the lighting of the monumental core in pure white light (metal halide). Phase 2 would carry this light along the major avenues of the L'Enfant city and around selected squares and circles. Mr. Atherton added that it might also be desirable to light important focal points with the same light. Lighting in the rest of the city would not be controlled. He said the most difficult part of implementing the plan would be to get the District government to change from sodium vapor to metal halide in the designated areas. He reported that the Historic American Buildings Survey was planning to nominate the L'Enfant plan to the National Register; because of this, he thought it would be possible to ask for some kind of federal payment to the city for changing the lights.

The Chairman said the big factor was cost. He said that although yellow-orange sodium vapor light was unattractive, especially when placed next to white light, it was inexpensive and bright, and appealed to the demand for security. He said that incandescent light was still used on the Lincoln Memorial and the center of the Mall. The Washington Monument and the Mall were now lit with metal halide, and it looked well. He commented that the dome of the Capitol was lit with metal

halide through filters making it more like incandescent, and he noted that there was much incandescent light on Capitol Hill. The Chairman also reported that at the last DOT lighting meeting an interesting possibility for lighting buildings was discussed involving a mix of sodium vapor and metal halide lamps. He then queried the members about circulating the staff proposals to other agencies, and there was unanimous agreement that the Secretary should do this.

Exhibit B-B-1

F. Inspection of 2620 Rock Creek Drive site conditions for conformance to Declaration of Covenant; 9 February 1990; U. S. District Court Civil Action No. 89-364 SSH, Instrument No. 9646.

The Secretary reviewed the settlement of the Woodland/Rock Creek Drive case. He said he would like to report, for the record, that the staff had inspected the landscaping and found that it conformed to the requirements of the settlement. He noted that there was a buyer for the property.

Before the first submission, the Chairman said he would like to state for the record that although he had announced his retirement as director of the National Gallery of Art, he did not intend to resign from the Commission of Fine Arts and at least looked forward to finishing out this term. He noted that although his predecessor, David Finley, had also served in both jobs, he had gone on for years as Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts after retiring from the Gallery, and there was no official connection between the National Gallery and the Commission of Fine Arts posts.

At this time, the Assistant Secretary took the opportunity to introduce Kimberlee Green, the Commission's new clerk-typist.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 16/APR/92-1, Federal Triangle Development site, 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Design development. (Previous: CFA 26/JUN/91-2). The Assistant Secretary recalled that during its last review the Commission had requested some refinement of the design of the 14th Street entrance and the drum of the dome on Pennsylvania Avenue. He introduced Jay Brodie from PADC to begin the presentation.

Mr. Brodie talked about the progress that had been made in the foundation work on the site, and he said they were ready to enter into a contract for the concrete work. He noted that the International Cultural and Trade Center would no longer be housed in the building, and said the space was

now being reconfigured: the retail shops, auditorium, atrium, one theatre, and the major circulation paths would remain; the other theatres would be taken out, as would the "world link". He said the blank wall for the IMAX theatre would now have the usual fenestration, but the rest of the exterior would remain exactly the same.

Mr. Peck asked if GSA would be a party to the new agreement that would be worked out with Congress, and if the complex would be open to the public; Mr. Brodie said that as far as he knew, the answer would be "yes" to both questions. Mr. Peck said he would want to see the design again if the building were to be closed to public use. In answer to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Brodie said he hoped Congress would act soon on the new agreement. The Chairman said he hoped as much as possible of the design would be saved.

Architect James Freed then showed slides and explained the changes that had been made in response to the Commission's comments. The 14th Street entrance was treated as a more separate element, eliminating the awkward situation where it met the main body of the building. Mr. Freed showed designs for several other doorways, as well as all the elevations. Then he showed both the original and a revised version of the dome on Pennsylvania Avenue, noting that the design of the drum had been altered, and the dome was more classic in proportion, making it more visible from sidewalk level. Turning to the hemicycle area, he pointed out the simple paving pattern and the two rows of trees; he said the pool and a wall in the open part of the lower level had been taken out to simplify it and improve circulation. Mr. Freed showed a design for tree lighting--a steel surround supporting decorative lights. Lastly, he showed material samples: granite setts for the walks, with a smooth finish so that people would not trip; grey granite for other paving and the base of the building; a grey-silver aluminum window trim, to contrast slightly with the limestone facing; and nickel silver for the doors.

Vice-Chairman Porterfield asked Mr. Freed what happened when the special granite paving of the plaza met Pennsylvania Avenue; Mr. Freed said it would run along the street in this area. The Vice-Chairman also commented on the lighting "cages" for the trees, saying he thought they were too heavy and would cover up the trunks. Mr. Hartman agreed, saying that the verticality should be kept, and the cage feeling avoided. He said it was important that the lighting be thoroughly integrated with the structure, and he thought that would be hard to do. Mr. Freed then commented on the lighting in general. He said the Washington globe would be used throughout, with other decorative fixtures flanking the doors. The buildings themselves would be lighted from each other

rather than using poles. The Chairman asked if the source would be seen; Mr. Freed said it would not.

There were no further questions. The members all agreed that the new designs for the 14th Street entrance and the Pennsylvania Avenue dome were much better and they were approved, along with the elevations and plaza design in general, and the materials. Further study was requested on the tree lighting. Exhibit C

B. U. S. Holocaust Memorial Council, U. S. Holocaust Memorial Museum

CFA 16/APR/92-2, U. S. Holocaust Museum, between 14th and 15th streets, S.W. Location for inscriptions, sculpture and flag poles; omission of west plaza fountain and pool. Staff member Sue Kohler noted for the record that the Commission had seen a large model of the west plaza area in the offices of the Holocaust Memorial Museum, prior to the meeting, and received a briefing on the submission from architect James Freed, from Pei Cobb Freed & Partners. She noted the presence at the meeting of Mr. Abramson, from the Holocaust Museum, and then introduced James Freed.

Mr. Freed showed slides, pointing out that the inscriptions would be placed in the blind panels on the Hall of Remembrance; the Eisenhower Memorial panel would be on the north wall of the middle level of the plaza; one piece of sculpture would be on the upper level and the other on the lower plaza level; and the grass panel and flagpole would both be on the lower plaza. (There would also be a flagpole at the 14th Street entrance.) Mr. Freed said the grass panel would replace the fountain/pool, in the same location. The pool had been eliminated because of expense and the possibility of leakage, but Mr. Freed said he actually preferred the grass panel because it tightened the space and softened the plaza. He said it would be raised slightly in the center so it would not look like it was sinking. Mr. Peck commented that to be effective the grass would have to be kept immaculate, and there could be no resorting to chains around it to keep people from walking on it. Mr. Freed said they were considering replacing the sod every year.

The sculptor, Joel Shapiro, was then introduced. He showed a model and samples of the bronze, pointing out the marks left in the bronze from the sawed-wood patterns. He described the 8-foot-high "house" element, to be placed on the lower plaza, as "dislocated, subverting a symbol of comfort, enclosure and continuity". The 24-foot-high "tree", located on the upper level, symbolized "cycles of life, death, anguish, the overcoming of anguish--and the possibilities of a future." He said neither piece would stand on a base. The

overall title for both pieces was: "For the dead and surviving children". The members thought the word order of the title was rather awkward, making the meaning unclear. Mr. Shapiro said he would try to re-word it.

The Chairman thought it would be good idea if some of this language were inscribed somewhere near the pieces; Mr. Freed said it could go on the granite step of the grass panel. It was generally agreed that the marriage of sculpture and architecture was good, but there was some concern that the "house" element might look too small on the large, paved plaza. Mr. Freed and Mr. Shapiro said they had considered this and had come to the conclusion that the scale was right. The Chairman said he thought the Commission could leave that up to them, but they might want to mock it up, just to reassure themselves.

The sculpture, grass panel and other items were unanimously approved, with the Chairman noting again that the grass must be perfectly maintained. Exhibit D

C. Smithsonian Institution

1. CFA 16/APR/92-3, Freer Gallery of Art, 12th Street and Jefferson Drive, S.W. Proposed site modifications, landscape and paving. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 16/JAN/92-4.) The Assistant Secretary recalled that the concept had been approved in January. He said that since that time there had been several minor revisions: a planting island had been altered, making access easier for visitors coming from the east; the number of hedges reduced; and access for the handicapped improved. He introduced Robert Dillman from the Smithsonian, who said that the changes had come about in response to requests from NCPC. Alan Resnick, from the firm of Sasaki & Associates, landscape architects, was then asked to discuss the revisions.

Mr. Resnick began with the island near the kiosk entry to the Quadrangle. He compared old and new drawings, pointing out that the shape had been altered so that it was more sympathetic to that of the plaza and the kiosk and circulation was easier. Then he noted that the hedges at the edge of the lawn area had been removed, although they had been retained at the front entrance. Another change was the removal of the benches along 12th Street and their replacement by a seating area in the center of that frontage. The sidewalk had also been widened along 12th Street. At the south entrance, the handicapped entrance had been widened, making it easier for wheelchair access. Mr. Resnick added that the street trees would be elms, consistent with the Inter-Agency Streetscape Plan. There were no objections to the revisions, and they were unanimously approved. Exhibit E

2. CFA 16/APR/92-4, National Zoological Park. Renovation of and rear addition to existing Monkey House, including "overhead Orangutan Transit System (OTS)". Preliminary design. Staff member Jose Martinez first noted that the members had seen the site for this project on their pre-meeting tour. He said it consisted of the removal of the old cages in front of the Monkey House and their replacement by a new glass and wire mesh enclosure; the removal of a retaining wall at the rear and the building there of an addition, faced with stucco; and the erection of an overhead, lightweight cable and truss system to allow the orangutans to travel between the Monkey House and Great Ape House. He said the work was being done by Coastal Designs, architects, and introduced Joseph Weiss from that firm. Mr.Weiss then introduced Dr. Beck from the Zoo to give the members some background information.

Dr. Beck said the Zoo faced three challenges as the 21st century approached: one having to do with captive breeding, another with animal welfare, and the third with public education. He said the Monkey House renovation addressed the later two, and commented that the type of display seen at the 1906 Monkey House, with the animals in barred cages, was now outdated, the nature of zoos having changed considerably in recent years. He said the Monkey House renovation would provide space to examine how animals "think", and the purpose of the overhead transit system was to have the orangutans demonstrate their cognative and locomotive abilities and give them a chance to function more like they would in their native habitat; for example, a variety of suspended structures would simulate the tree canopies where so much of the orangutans' normal activities take place. There would be a "smart room" in the glazed area in front of the Monkey House where they could pick up tools, use and return them; the public could also see them as they interacted with their keepers. The new addition would accommodate a variety of interpretative exhibits.

Landscape architect Nancy Denney, who had worked on the Olmsted Walk renovation for the Zoo, was then introduced. She said the circulation between the Monkey House, Reptile House, and Great Ape House now involved much cutting across landscaped areas, and a system of walks needed to be added to make it clear which way to go. She said the so-called Orangutan Transit System would be carefully designed in relation to the open space and to Olmsted Walk, which it crossed in two places. She said it would be at these crossings that most of the interaction with visitors would occur. The structure itself had been designed so that the angle of the roofs of the old structures was repeated, and it would be made high enough--about 35 feet--so that the orangutans, who are naturally cautious, would not be tempted

to jump off. She said the color had not yet been worked out, but it would not be too bright and would blend with the older buildings. Mr. Hartman said it was very large--about 700 feet long--and should be designed as a garden structure.

The Chairman said the most important concern in this project, from the Commission's point of view, was marrying the old buildings and landscape with the new. He noted the wonderful tile roof and rubble walls of the Monkey House, and said he was worried about the blandness of the stucco addition planned for the rear. Mr. Weiss commented that the Monkey House had been renovated twice in the past twenty years, each time unsuccessfully, from a zoological standpoint. He said he was well aware of the wonderful roof structure and all new construction would be kept below it; he hoped that the renovation would increase the building's importance in the zoo and focus more attention on it. He pointed out that the stucco addition would look out on a steam plant and service road, and he said it would be only marginally visible from Rock Creek Park.

The Chairman suggested that all the new additions might be glazed, so that the impact on the old building would not be so great. Mr. Hartman said he was not sure that great sheets of glass were right, that perhaps glazing in the style of turn-of-the-century train sheds would be more appropriate. The Chairman then suggested that rather than try to force any additions on the building, it could be left alone and used for some purpose other than housing animals; a new Monkey House, geared to the current thinking, could then be built. Dr. Beck said he would be reluctant to do this because of cost. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she liked the idea of leaving the building as it was, from a preservation point of view, architecturally and as a reminder of what zoo buildings used to be like.

Vice-Chairman Porterfield agreed that the old building was really counter-productive to the new emphasis on teaching the public how wild animals live. He was also concerned about the number of trees that would have to be removed to accommodate the project, and he thought that if it had to be done, the structure should be made as light as possible and the maximum number of trees saved. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor questioned the preprogramming of the OTS--she wondered of there was any assurance the orangutans would use it once it was built; she recalled playgrounds with equipment that was never used as intended. Ms. Denny said she understood the problem, but they had made provisions for abstracting many normal activities, and were reasonably sure the animals would respond. Ms. Abrahamson commented that the designers of the playground equipment had undoubtedly made the same kind of studies.

It was agreed by all that the entire project needed more study. The addition, in particular, was disapproved, with the recommendation that if it had to be done, all of it should be as transparent as possible. The concept of the OTS was considered an interesting one, but there was concern about its size, and a request for further study of ways to keep it as unobtrusive and respectful of the landscape as possible.

Exhibit F

(The meeting was adjourned for lunch at 12:50 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)

D. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 16/APR/92-5, Vietnam Women's Memorial. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 19/SEP/91-1.) Mrs. Kohler showed a photograph of the previously approved design for the sculpture for this memorial, designed by Glenna Goodacre. Then she showed a sketch by the Planning Commission staff, suggesting a major change in the posture of the kneeling figure; this was followed by a revised version by Ms. Goodacre, incorporating several of the minor changes requested. The change in posture had not been incorporated; the board of the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project had considered it unacceptable because it removed the feeling of isolation and despair so important to the figure. Mrs. Kohler pointed out that the helmet had been moved from the right to the left hand, as requested by NCPC, the head had been turned slightly towards the helmet, and the free hand, instead of resting on the thigh, was held in an extended, open position. Mrs. Kohler noted also that the left hand of the standing figure had been lowered and placed closer to the body, eliminating what the Park Service had thought was a potential hazard to children, who might run into it.

Mrs. Kohler introduced Diane Carlson Evans, chairman of the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project, to discuss the changes. She said she had worked with the sculptor to respond to the suggestions made, and while they were not willing to alter the kneeling figure to the extent requested, they could accept the changes now being presented to the Commission. It was thought that the changed position of the helmet would help hide some of the sandbags, and the slight change in the turn of the head would show more of the face; the position of the hand was something the artist did not feel strongly about. Ms. Evans read a letter from the artist commenting on the revisions.

Ms. Chatfield-Taylor said she was not sure the sculpture had been improved; in fact, she found it weakened. The Chairman was concerned that the helmet had lost its symbolism and become part of the mass of the sandbags, and he thought the change in the position of the head had diminished the poignancy and feeling of emptiness the figure had as she

kneeled with her back to the other nurse, alone with her thoughts. Mr. Peck said he preferred the hand as it was originally, that it had more strength. Vice-Chairman Porterfield and Ms. Abrahamson felt that by focusing the gaze on the helmet, the figure had lost the feeling of despair it had originally.

Mr. Peck asked to comment on the review process. He said he thought the Planning Commission was exceeding its bounds when it started making specific comments on a piece of sculpture. He thought it was particularly inappropriate for the staff to make a sketch, explaining to the artist just how the design should be altered. The Chairman agreed and said he would like write a letter to NCPC on this matter. He said the Commission of Fine Arts did not comment on planning, and he did not think the Planning Commission should comment on a work of art--especially to the point of telling the artist how to redesign it.

John Parsons from the Park Service (and also a member of NCPC) asked to comment. He said the Planning Commission had taken exception to the fact that they had never been asked to review the original sculpture; their rationale for wanting to review it was the Commemorative Works Act, which said that both the site and design for memorials had to be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, the Planning Commission, and the Secretary of the Interior (or the Administrator of General Services, as appropriate). He said that although the Commission might not be aware of it, it was common practice for NCPC to make design comments and offer sketches. The Chairman said he interpreted the Commemorative Works Act to mean site and architectural design, not the design of works of art associated with the memorial. He said this kind of duplicate review could send applicants back and forth to the two commissions forever. Ms. Chatfield-Taylor added that this was a common problem with review agencies all over the country.

The consensus was that the Commission did not think the design had been improved by the changes; it was suggested, however, that the comments made be given to the artist, and that she be allowed to make the final decision. Exhibit G

2. CFA 16/APR/92-6, East Potomac Park Golf Course, Ohio Drive, S.W. Preliminary design. Staff member Jeffrey Carson said the project consisted of renovations and additions to a golf course that had been on the site since the 1920s. He showed photographs and site plans, noting the original clubhouse, and the driving range, putting greens, miniature golf course, and swimming pool. He said there would be an increase in the parking, a new pro shop, snack bar, rain shelters, maintenance facility, and driving range structure.

He introduced Jeff Knoedler from the Park Service to begin the presentation. Mr. Knoedler said the original design of the buildings and open space had been carefully researched before any plans had been developed. He noted that it was a popular facility, with as many as 2,500 people a day. He then introduced architect Mary Oehrlein to discuss her proposals.

Speaking first about the circulation and parking, Ms. Oehrlein said that at present all the traffic came into the site through one driveway; she had done some reorganization so that there would be separate entrances and parking areas for separate uses; she also said the parking for each use would be increased. Trees would be planted in the parking areas, and landscaping in general would be augmented, with existing trees being kept. The original clubhouse would remain, and the new structures would all be light golf/park frame structures, with asphalt shingle roofs.

The new structures were all unanimously approved, as was the concept for revised access and circulation. Vice-Chairman Porterfield thought, however, that the parking lot needed more trees and hedges--a five-foot planting strip in each bay; he recalled the use of this kind of heavy planting in France. The Chairman agreed, saying that the parking lot could be made part of the park environment. He added that this was a chance for the Park Service to develop a public course that would compare with the best in the country. A question was asked about an ill-defined area north of the old clubhouse; Ms. Oehrlein said it belonged to the District government and contained the pool house and a police station; she said she would like to be able to do something about the landscaping when the other work was done; Mr. Knoedler said he would discuss this with the District government. Exhibit H

E. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

CFA 16/APR/92-7, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia. Facility maintenance complex. Preliminary design. The Assistant Secretary said this new maintenance complex would be built on a parking lot next to the existing facility. He introduced Mr. Metzler, superintendent of Arlington Cemetery, and his assistant, Joe Buntin, and then introduced architect David Cox, from Kress Cox Associates, to discuss the design.

Mr. Cox pointed out the site, noting the proximity to Columbia Pike, I-395, and the Pentagon, and commenting that it was convenient because it was near the South Gate where materials were delivered. He said the complex would be made up of simple, functional buildings, with space to house over 100 vehicles, and added that they had tried to be sensitive to cemetery uses, the important axes--Memorial Bridge, the

Amphitheatre, and the Columbarium--and the presence of the Pentagon. As far as architectural style was concerned, he said there was no particular "cemetery style" to be picked up on. He showed a photograph of an existing cemetery service facility near Fort Myer, which consisted of old, dormered horse stables, and the 1970s service facility adjacent to the site (scheduled to remain), which was made up of four painted brick, shed roof buildings. He noted that the South Gate was also a "back-door" VIP entrance and was used for ceremonial purposes, so that had to be considered in the design.

Mr. Cox showed a site plan, model, and drawings of the buildings, noting that the complex would be in a sunken area and enclosed with a wall, faced with fieldstone where it was visible from the ceremonial area. He said they did not yet have a landscape plan, but there would definitely be buffer areas of trees and shrubs to cut down on the visibility. The drawings showed five square brick buildings with steep saw-tooth roofs, set diagonally in a stepped-back pattern along Patton Drive; Mr. Cox said the height would be 60 feet to the highest point of the roof. He said the cemetery wall would be brought out close to Columbia Pike to accommodate the facility and a parking area for employees.

The Chairman was concerned that there was too much architecture; the sculptured forms looked too monumental. Mr. Cox said they could not use flat roofs because of their visibility when looking down on the area. The Chairman thought that ordinary shed roofs would look better, and both he and Mr. Hartman thought the height should be cut as much as possible. The Chairman commented that the facility would look better tucked back into the trees, where the former horse stable service facility was located, although he realized that might involve heavy truck traffic going through the cemetery all the way from the Columbia Pike entrance, if alternative access via Fort Myer could not be arranged. Mr. Peck said he was not that much bothered by either the style or the location, and he thought the buildings would be much less obtrusive in actuality than they appeared on the model or in drawings.

There was some further discussion, and Mr. Cox was asked to look at the design again in light of the Commission's comments, and particularly to try to reduce the height. The Secretary said he would like to take the members on a general tour of the cemetery, and at the time they could see the proposed site for this project. Mr. Metzler said he would be happy to arrange a tour whenever it would be convenient.

Exhibits I, I-1, & I-2

F. Department of Justice

CFA 16/APR/92-8, J. Edgar Hoover Building, 935 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Child care area. Preliminary design. Mr. Martinez said this would be an outdoor playground area on the mezzanine level of the FBI Building, at the corner of 9th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. He introduced Brian Stephenson from the firm of Stephenson & Good, landscape architects, to make the presentation.

Mr. Stephenson said this would be a playground only--the day care center was located elsewhere--and access would be by stairway or ramp. There would be up to sixty children using the playground at one time, and they would range in age from infants to five-year-olds. He said the area would be fenced in, the floor covered with a green rubber material, and there would be a small storeroom in addition to the standard metal and plastic playground equipment. To give a more decorative and child-like feeling to the space, the concrete columns would be covered with wood panels painted in various shapes and colors. There would also be supplemental lighting that would be on only when the playground was in use.

The members had no objections to the plans, and they were unanimously approved; it was thought that the playground would help humanize the building a bit. Exhibit J

G. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

Appendix I. The appendix was approved without objection.

The Secretary said he would like to have an informal discussion regarding a request from the Corcoran Gallery of Art; this involved the installation of banners on the building for the purpose of announcing exhibitions. (The proposal would eventually come before the Commission as a formal Shipstead-Luce submission.) Mr. Atherton showed drawings of banners projecting at right angles to the face of the building on both the 17th Street and New York Avenue frontages. They would be 9 by 12 feet and would be attached to permanent hardware projecting from the facades.

The Chairman said he liked the use of banners because of their festive quality; he cited those on the Metropolitan Museum in New York and the Portrait Gallery in Washington. He said he had never been happy with the fabric "signs" the Corcoran wrapped around the corner of the building to announce

exhibitions, which tended to be too small and not quite free enough.

Mr. Hartman said he did not object to banners, but he thought the Corcoran was an exceptionally fine building, and as there was no colonnade, the banners would have to be placed very carefully on the facade, and done in the style of the building; he recommended a placement lower than that shown on the drawing. It was thought that the Corcoran staff should give the matter further study, and the Secretary said he would return the application with the Commission's suggestions.

2. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix II. The appendix was approved without objection.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A

7 May 1992

Dear Mr. McDaniel:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on 16 April, ratified an earlier approval of the revised concept designs for the White House Guard structures that we had obtained by circulating material and polling members for their views. These views were conveyed by the Secretary, Charles Atherton, to Mike Summerlin of your office on 2 April.

To summarize briefly, the general direction of design development was approved with the request that further study be given to refining proportions and details of columniation, profiles of moldings on architraves, and the like. Facades utilizing columns as a design element should be divided with an odd number of spaces between columns. One of the drawings we looked at incorporated three columns on the facade, dividing the elevation in two, an arrangement that should be avoided. Finally, columns should be treated uniformly, with the same vertical dimensions and bases. The entasis should probably key on the colonnade along the south front of the west wing.

We will be happy to meet with you at any time to review further design developments.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James I. McDaniel
White House Liaison
National Park Service Regional Office
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W., Room 344
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

10 June 1992

Dear Jerry White:

As you know, several agencies have been working on a scheme to unify all street lighting in what can generally be described as the monumental core. There still are a number of places where sodium vapor lights are installed, such as Independence Avenue, SW and several north-south streets through the Federal Triangle, but it is generally hoped they can be converted to white metal halide throughout the entire federal area in the not-too-distant future. These efforts are being made for the most part on an ad hoc basis and, as far as I know, there is no official plan for street lighting per se.

Because of this, it would be appropriate if we all agreed on such a plan so that some unified effort could be made to follow through.

At a recent meeting of the Commission, the staff presented some ideas on this subject, and we thought it might be useful to circulate them for your comments. In addition to giving a definite shape to the core area where the white halide would prevail, they also had a proposal that would extend this same type of lighting outward on selected radial avenues and grid streets and include important squares and circles. The idea is to identify key elements of the original L'Enfant plan and to highlight their importance in the city. The reason for doing so is two-fold: First, and most significantly, the National Park Service is in the process of having the entire plan designated as a national historic landmark. Giving its major elements a special quality such as street lighting would be in accord with its special status. The other reason is primarily aesthetic -- the white halide is certainly a more appropriate light on major avenues as a source of illumination. It has none of the unfortunate associations of sodium vapor, which brings to mind high-speed expressways and suburban malls. As seen from the air, and from higher vantage points throughout the city, of which there are many, it would bring the plan to life through the contrasting colors of the light. This would give the plan a most unique aspect not seen in any other world capitals.

We feel the idea has merit, but we recognize the only way it can be achieved is through an extensively coordinated effort on the part of many players. We therefore ask that you schedule a review of the enclosed documents and let us know your reactions. Obviously the expense, if there is agreement, will primarily be federal in nature, and this should be borne in mind when considering the practical implications of implementing the plan.

In the meantime, the staff will be happy to supply you with any additional information you feel is necessary in order to arrive at a position on this proposal. They would also welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter with your staff personnel, or to make a brief presentation should you feel that would be useful.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. George M. White
Architect of the Capitol
U.S. Capitol Building
Room SB-15
Washington, D.C. 20515

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

4 May 1992

EXHIBIT C

Dear Mr. Hauser:

The Commission approved design refinements for the Federal Triangle project at its 16 April 1992 meeting. Since our last review in June 1991, the architects have developed a better defined entrance on Fourteenth Street and improved proportions for the dome on the corner of Thirteenth Street. Both of these features were approved, as were the samples of roof, wall, and paving materials that were presented.

A remaining question came up informally, however, about the use of granite pavers crossing the sidewalk all the way to the curb, thereby disrupting the standard paver used throughout the rest of the PADC area. While we understand that it is being done to focus attention on the new entrances, there are those who wonder if it is worth sacrificing what otherwise would be a totally uniform treatment common to all other areas of Pennsylvania Avenue and the Federal Triangle. In addition, for some, such a device also bears a rather unfortunate association with commercial office buildings which commonly roll out a "carpet" of rich materials to announce their entrances. We believe it is worth further discussion.

Finally there was some comment about the tree guards, which to some of us looked overly heavy. Are these to be specially fabricated or are they readily available? It might be a good idea to erect a sample enclosure on the site such as has been done with other elements of street furniture over the course of the avenue's development.

We will be meeting again on 21 May and we would be happy to drop by the site and discuss these two items and to see any mockups you may have.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard Hauser, Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
Suite 1220 North
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-1703

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

4 May 1992

Dear Mr. Gurland:

At its meeting on 16 April the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed changes to the West Plaza of the U. S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, and the proposed locations for flagpoles, inscriptions, the Eisenhower memorial, and two pieces of sculpture by Joel Shapiro.

Prior to the meeting the members viewed a large model of the plaza area at your office; this was very helpful, and the Commission appreciates your making this inspection possible.

There was no objection to the removal of the pool/fountain from the lower plaza and the use of a rectangular grass panel instead. The Commission's only question was whether the proper maintenance could be provided to keep the grass in perfect condition; unless it can, the panel will not be successful as a design element.

The members were pleased with Joel Shapiro's sculpture. There was one concern: will the house be large enough to hold its own in that large space? We understand that architect James Freed and Mr. Shapiro have discussed this and feel that the scale is correct. The Commission would be willing to trust their judgement in this matter, but suggests that they might want to build a mock-up on the site to assure themselves further. Another suggestion made was that a brief explanatory text, such as that read by Mr. Shapiro, be placed near the sculpture, so that it would take on added meaning for the visitor.

The location of the flagpoles and the inscriptions, and the revision to the north wall to accommodate the Eisenhower memorial, were approved.

An item that was not discussed at the meeting but came up informally was the question of carrying special paving to the curb. It is a matter of some importance, and we understand you have already talked about it with the Park

Service. The Commission plans to visit the site during its pre-meeting tour on 21 May; perhaps we could discuss the paving during the meeting.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Gerald Gurland, FAIA
Director of Development/Coordinator of Construction
The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum
2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 717
Washington, D.C. 20036

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT E

4 May 1992

Dear Mr. Dillman:

During its meeting 16 April 1992, the Commission reviewed and approved revisions to the concept design for the Freer paving and landscape renovations considered last January. As always, it is a pleasure to work with you to ensure fruition of the various on-going improvements to the Smithsonian complex. The Commission looks forward to seeing the working drawings for the Freer when ready.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert P. Dillman, P.E.
Director, Office of Design and Construction
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. 20560

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT F

4 May 1992

Dear Dr. Robinson:

During its meeting of 16 April 1992, the Commission reviewed proposals for the Orangutan Transit System (OTS) and a renovation of and addition to the historic Monkey House. The changes to the Monkey house were designed to accommodate a change in function which would emphasize educational material and fewer animal exhibits.

According to the submission, the new program calls for a large, curved, stucco-surfaced addition to the rear of the Monkey House as well as new animal enclosures in glass and wire mesh to replace the existing antiquated cages at the front. The two structures, rear addition and front enclosures, would be unrelated in style and material not only to each other but to the historic building to which they would be attached. Under such circumstances, there is real danger that the Monkey House could lose its architectural identity altogether.

We believe a different solution is required. One avenue of approach would be to see the Monkey House, its style and materials, as a source for the design of new construction. The possibilities could be charming provided they showcase the historic structure. The best would be to find a use for the historic building more compatible with its original size, and find a location and purpose-built design for a new and up-to-date Monkey House.

The OTS is a different matter. The Commission was fascinated by the idea of such large animals given apparent freedom to move about the park, illusory as this would be in reality. Nevertheless, 700 feet of structure more than 35 feet high is potentially daunting unless handled with great skill. Design refinement and material that alluded to the era of the Monkey House and the age of cast iron could point the way to a satisfying design solution. When considering an exotic project of this scale, there is much to be said for a full-scale mock-up.

During the meeting more than one member voiced concern over the program in general. These concerns boiled down to two questions. Should so much be squeezed into so small a

space, especially one of historic architectural merit? Will the OTS permanently change to its detriment the character of Olmsted Walk? These are questions that deserve very careful consideration.

As always, the Commission will work closely with you and offer the assistance of the staff should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Dr. Michael Robinson
Director
National Zoological Park
3000 Connecticut Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

4 May 1992

EXHIBIT G

Dear Mr. Stanton:

At its meeting on 16 April, the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed minor design modifications to the sculpture for the Vietnam Women's Memorial.

The members were pleased that the board of the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project limited the changes suggested by the staff of the National Capital Planning Commission to those presented; if the posture of the kneeling figure had been changed, the poignancy and feeling of isolation and despair would have been lost.

There were no serious objections to moving the helmet from the right to the left hand, if the sculptor really feels this improves the composition; but the members thought that the change in the position of the head, focusing the gaze on the helmet, lessened the feeling of isolation and anguish. Also, the open hand position did not have the impact of the original, depicted as resting on the thigh. It was noted also that an open hand would be more subject to vandalism.

The Commission agreed with the Park Service that the change in the position of the left hand of the standing figure would remove a potential hazard without changing the emotional impact of the figure.

In short, although the Commission remains enthusiastic about this piece, the members did not feel that the design had been improved by the changes. It was suggested that the Commission's comments be given to the artist, and that she be allowed to make the final decision.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert G. Stanton, Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

4 May 1992

EXHIBIT H

Dear Mr. Stanton:

During it meeting of 16 April 1992, the Commission reviewed preliminary designs for concession and maintenance improvements at the East Potomac Golf Course on Ohio Drive. The members are pleased with the scope of the work and the direction of the architect and urge that every effort be expended to ensure quality of design and construction. The opportunity is at hand to provide the public with a facility worthy of this exceptional and highly visible site.

With users numbering in the thousands each day, prudence dictates care in every aspect of this endeavor. For this reason, critical attention was focussed on the proposed parking treatment. As a forecourt to the golf course (and public swimming pool) complex, an unrelieved expanse of asphalt will be readily visible from the air and, from the point of view of the user, a heat trap in the summer. The most obvious solution is to provide trees, many of them. The parking area should be a discreet showcase for landscaped parking design, one that might provide the pattern for similar facilities in parks around the country.

As an aside, the Commission is aware of the dismal conditions surrounding the public pool facility. Whereas the members realize that this portion of the overall complex is outside the purview of the Park Service, it is hoped that a dialogue with the District Government might be initiated to find the means to improve this site as well. Since the public perceives the pool and golf area as a unit, it would be desirable to renovate both at the same time.

As always, the staff is available should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert Stanton, Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT I

4 May 1992

Dear Mr. Metzler:

It was good to meet you at the Commission's 16 April 1992 meeting and to hear of your plans for Arlington Cemetery. As you know from ensuing discussions, we have some concerns about the expanded maintenance facility and have decided to postpone any final conclusions pending a site inspection on 21 May as part of our next meeting. Our specific concern is that the proposed structures may be over-designed and have too much architectural presence for the site.

We plan to arrive at about eight-thirty which would give us a chance to inspect the site, the stables area, and any other sites you feel will be coming up for future discussion. Later, during the formal meeting, we will have an opportunity to discuss the project further with you, the architects and the Corps. Until then Don Myer can be reached for questions or coordination at 202-504-2200.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

John C. Metzler, Jr.
Superintendent of Arlington Cemetery
Arlington National Cemetery
Arlington, VA 22211-5003

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT I-1

4 May 1992

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

The Commission met with Mrs. Tyo, from the Corps, and Mr. Metzler, Superintendent of Arlington Cemetery, on 16 April 1992 to discuss designs for the Cemetery Maintenance Facility. As you can see from our enclosed letter to Mr. Metzler, we feel a site visit is the next step and that some additional architectural study will probably be necessary.

The proposed facility's gateway location is what leads us to believe that the design may be overly architectural. If the location is to be pursued, the design ought to be reconsidered with less height and more landscaping. We realize the need for convenient highway proximity for large, heavy deliveries, but are concerned about the visibility of this facility on a peripheral site. Thus we wonder if consideration was given to a more discrete consolidated service access and maintenance area for both the Cemetery and Ft. Myer.

With your concurrence we will proceed to arrange an inspection and place the matter on our 21 May 1992 agenda. Don Myer can be reached for questions or coordination at 202-504-2200.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard C. Armstrong, P.E.
Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Military Programs
Department of The Army
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Washington, D.C. 20314-1000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT 1-2

4 May 1992

Dear Colonel Reth:

The Commission staff has studied the reports for the Fort McNair and Fort Myer master plans and appreciates the early opportunity to consider these documents. As you know, the Commission review will include the design of buildings and landscape, and the preservation of historic elements. As these projects develop we will be happy to assist you with submission requirements.

Aside from the proposed landscaping of Fort McNair, which has had NCPC, but not Fine Arts review, the Commission is most concerned about the Fort Myer master plan and the eleven specific projects it identifies. The proposed renovation and expansion of the vehicular maintenance compound adjacent to a primary Ft. Myer entrance and Arlington National Cemetery is of particular concern. The Commission is presently considering Arlington Cemetery's proposal to move its maintenance complex to a spot along its southeastern boundary. This will leave the existing location available for potential burial sites, suggesting a further visual conflict with the Fort Myer maintenance compound.

We are enclosing copies of the Commission's letters on the Cemetery project for your reference and look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Colonel Thomas B. Reth
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Military District of Washington
Washington, D.C. 20319-5050

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT J

4 May 1992

Dear Mr. Burrell:

During its meeting of 16 April 1992, the Commission reviewed and approved the proposed child day-care play area for the mezzanine terrace of the J. Edgar Hoover Building. While the facility will be only marginally visible from public space, what can be seen should provide the building with a bit of welcome color and life.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Benjamin F. Burrell, Director
Facilities & Administrative
Services Staff
Justice Management Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.